

1 [REDACTED] TRANSMITTAL [REDACTED]

18/12/70

DATE:

18/12/70

MEMORANDUM FOR: /Military Service/

SUBJECT : Results of Photo Comparison,  
Case No. [REDACTED] 12,517

REFERENCE : Request from NOK of Rev. H. P. [REDACTED]

1. Transmitted herewith are results of photo comparison analysis between the Christmas 1969 film of American PWs in North Vietnam and photographs submitted with reference.

2. The evidence cited in the attached report does not constitute definitive proof of the status or identity of individuals portrayed in the questioned photographs.

3. Since the Agency's participation in this program is classified, the fact of such participation must not be revealed. This report, therefore, may not be used in an unclassified arena, and the Agency cannot be responsible for any action or decision based in whole or in part on the judgments expressed in the report.

4. All materials received from your office in connection with subject request are returned herewith.

FOR THE CHIEF [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Signature [REDACTED] F

Attachments:

- (1) Christmas 1969 comparison No.
- (2) Materials submitted with request
  - (a) Overlay
  - (b) precapture photos
  - (c) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

I

MEMORANDUM FOR: Military Service

SUBJECT : Results of Photo Comparison,  
Case No. 12,517

REFERENCE : Request from NOK of Rev. H. P. Livingston

1. Transmitted herewith are results of photo comparison analysis between the Christmas 1969 film of American PWs in North Vietnam and photographs submitted with reference.

2. The evidence cited in the attached report does not constitute definitive proof of the status or identity of individuals portrayed in the questioned photographs.

3. Since the Agency's participation in this program is classified, the fact of such participation must not be revealed. This report, therefore, may not be used in an unclassified arena, and the Agency cannot be responsible for any action or decision based in whole or in part on the judgments expressed in the report.

4. All materials received from your office in connection with subject request are returned herewith.

FOR THE CHIEF  Signature

Attachments:

- (1) Christmas 1969 comparison No. \_\_\_\_\_
- (2) Materials submitted with request
  - (a) Overlay
  - (b) \_\_\_\_\_ precapture photos
  - (c) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Combined Form for Service and [redacted] U

Date of Report: 12/1/76

PHOTO COMPARISON ANALYSIS RESULTS: Christmas 1969 No. 33 (D.A.)

Military Service

1. (U) Summary of request: (Date received: \_\_\_\_\_)

a. Please compare the attached 2 pre-capture photographs of NAVY THOMAS H. ALKINGILL with the Christmas 1969 film obtained by Representative Zion, especially prints numbered DIA 33  
USN \_\_\_\_\_ USAF \_\_\_\_\_

b. See attached overlay for exact location of image to be compared.

2. (U) Summary of comparison performed:

a. The following frames were chosen for comparison with the photographs submitted: #33

b. He technicians working independently of each other analyzed the identifiable features listed below.

3. I [redacted] Results of analysis:

a. (U) Quality of pre-capture photographs submitted: Adequate inadequate for analysis of recognizable features.

b. (U) Quality of frames in Christmas film: Adequate inadequate for analysis of recognizable features.

c. I [redacted] The following features were considered similar:

- (1) Hairline
- (2) Nose structure
- (3) Jaw configuration
- (4) \_\_\_\_\_

- [REDACTED] I C
- (5) \_\_\_\_\_
  - (6) \_\_\_\_\_
  - (7) \_\_\_\_\_
  - (8) \_\_\_\_\_
  - (9) \_\_\_\_\_

d. I [REDACTED] The following features were considered dissimilar:

- (1) Ear set - formation
- (2) Nose tip
- (3) Nose shape
- (4) \_\_\_\_\_
- (5) \_\_\_\_\_

e. I [REDACTED] Conclusion:

- (1) In view of the similarity in general appearance and significant number of similar features, \_\_\_\_\_ could be the subject of the questioned photographs.
- (2) In view of the significant number of differences in distinguishable features, DIA POW # 35 probably is not the subject of the questioned photographs.
- (3) In view of the quality of photography and the small number of distinguishable features which could be compared, no conclusion can be reached.

f. (U) The same image has been compared with pre-capture photographs of \_\_\_\_\_ Air Force, \_\_\_\_\_ Navy, \_\_\_\_\_ Marine, \_\_\_\_\_ Army, and \_\_\_\_\_ civilian personnel.

[REDACTED] I

4.

**WARNING:** This photo comparison analysis was performed utilizing the best available techniques, however, the quality of the photographs in question precluded positive identification. There may be other overriding factors concerning the individual's case which could confirm or invalidate the photo comparison analysis.

Attachments:

- (a) Overlay or questioned photo
- (b) Precapture photo 2